



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—*A Word Miscellany*

BY PROFESSOR EDWIN W. FAY

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

I. PLANTS AND A PLANT-CHARM

i. Skr. *óṣa-dhi-s* = brenn-pflanze

1. THE explanation of the Petersburg lexicon (*PW.*¹) from *avasa-dhi-* 'nahrungenthaltend' is not inappropriate semantically, and aptly fits not less than a dozen instances in the *Rig Veda*. In several dozen places the reference is to green or growing plants, or to vegetation in general. In a few of these the plants are personified, not to say deified, as in 10, 97, addressed to plants of medicinal application, simples (cf. dialectic *yarbs* = herbs), as dried (? cf. *babhrū-* 'brown' in stz. 1) and stored up by the physician (stz. 6). But allusion to the medicinal use is otherwise rare (cf. 6, 52, 6; 10, 145, 1).

2. More than a dozen instances remain that describe the plants as fire-containers, the source of fire, and this justifies the inquiry whether in the compound *óṣa-* does not mean 'fire.' Then *-dhi-*, cognate with *dhāyas-* 'nutriens,' is the second member, perhaps (cf. *Aen.* 1, 176, where *nutrimenta* = *fōmes* [*fō(y)* : *dhe(y)-?*] 'kindling'). But instead of 'igni-nutriens,' I think rather of *óṣa-dhi-s* as 'brenn-pflanze,' comparing *-dhi-* with Lat. *fē-tus* (of vegetable growths) and *fēnum* 'hay' (?), to the root *dhe(y)-* 'nutrire' (cf. Lat. *fē-līx* and its kin). Here also belong Skr. *dhā-nyā-m* 'frumentum,' *ākro-thī-via* 'first-fruits,' and *θā-μνος* 'bush' (morphologically like *στά-μνος*). In *θā-λ-os* (n.) as perhaps in *fē-līx*, the *l* has become a determinative, while the *ā* of *τēθāλa* (: *θāλλω*) is due to a secondary gradation.

3. I foresee stumbling here touching the general sense, 'plant,' but I plead Ger. *reis* 'twig,' which, by a quite reasonable and even convincing definition, means 'quod tremit,' equally descriptive of 'twig' or 'bush,' but *reis* further means 'fagot.' With *óṣa-dhi-s* I suppose the reverse, that 'fagot' was generalized to 'brush.' The nomenclature is even sim-

pler: hay, dry leaves, twigs, fagots will all have been used for kindling (*fō-mes*), and collectively called *ōṣa-dhi-s*, 'brennpflanze.' No wonder if the same name was applied to these materials undried and uncut. He who made the identification *brushes are fagots* would have no difficulty in shifting subject and predicate to *fagots are brushes* (*i.e.* brenn-pflanzen sind pflanzen).

ii. Lat. *ver-bena*

4. If *θάμνος* and *fē-num* (§ 2) have been correctly derived from the root *dhē(y)-* 'nutrire,' we have good reason for treating *ver-bēna* as a compound, either = 'door-plant' (*ver-*: Umbr. *vero-*), or better, 'mountain-plant,' quasi 'arci-herba' (*ver-*: Skr. *girī-s*, Av. *gairi-ś* 'mons'). Further cognates of *ver-* 'peak, spitze' are Lat. *veru* 'spit,' *verertrum* 'mentula' (see *AJP*. 31, 417). This explanation of *ver-bēna* fadges precisely with Pliny, *N.H.* 22, 5: *sagmina in remediis publicis fuere et in sacris legationibusque verbenae. certe utroque nomine idem significatur, hoc est gramen ex arce cum sua terra evolsum.* If we can credit Pliny with knowing his facts, *ver-* = 'ark' and *ver-bēna* = 'arci-herba.'

5. As for *verber* 'whip' (sg. masc.), which is rare (cf. Neue, *Formenl.*³ I, 712), its cognate is Skr. *vārdhra-s* 'strip of leather' (: *vārdhana-m* 'abschneiden'). Plautus has only *verbera* (n. plur.; cf. *locus* : *loca*) and an ably. of secondary formation, *verberibus*. The Plautine hapax *subverbustus* is a momentaneous analogical formation (*onera* : *onustus* :: *verbera* : *-verbustus*), cf. *Aul.* 409, 414, *ita me miserum et meos discipulos fustibus male contuderunt . . . itaque omnis exigit foras, me atque hos, onustos fustibus.*

iii. Latin *fetiales; sagmina*

5a. The *fetiales*, in their mission of making truces and treaties, carried a flint or flints (*silices*) wherewith to slay the sacrificial swine, but they also carried, and this seems the more characteristic of their office, *verbenae* or *sagmina*, as in Livy, I, 24, 5, *fetialis arce graminis herbam puram attulit* (cf. also 30, 43, 9). This makes it possible to regard *fetialis* as a

derivation of *fetus* 'plant' (§ 2), or even, as an archaic religious word, to look upon it as a compound of *fet*o/_u_- 'plant' + **yak-s-lis* 'iaciens': Av. *yax-ś-tiś* 'twig' [cf. for the idea 'item ex se eicere' in Varro, and Fr. *jeter*, Span. *echar* (from Lat. (*e*)*jectare*) 'to send out shoots']. How did the fetials employ the *sagmina* which they bore? On one occasion, before starting on their mission, by touching a member of their group, to designate him as *pater patratus* (Livy, I, 24, 6), but it is also reported (Marcian. *Dig.* I, I, 8, I) that wearing the *sagmina* was a sign of their ambassadorial character. But from Livy, I, 24, 8, supplemented by Paulus-Festus, 82, 8 (cf. also Polybius, 3, 25), we learn that the flint with which the swine had been slaughtered was subsequently cast away with an imprecation that Jupiter would so strike with a flint (his thunderbolt?) the fetial, if guilty of conscious perjury. Was a similar disposition made of the *sagmina*, attended by an imprecation so "to weed out" (§ 6) the fetial, if guilty of perjury, from his native land? We know so few details of fetial procedure that, inasmuch as Latin literature has preserved only in Paul the Deacon, abridging Festus, the tradition of the casting away of the *silex*, it is not all too rash to suppose such an unreported casting away of the *sagmina* also by the *fetialis* (=? 'plant-caster'). Finally, if the *sagmina* were used as garlands by the *fetales*, or used to bind the swine for sacrifice (see on Skr. *badhnāti*, (§ 19), the definition 'withies, bands' is apt. This admits of deriving *s-agmina* from *s(w)-* 'co-' (§ 14, fn.) + a cognate of *ἄγνος* 'withy' (§ 39).

iv. Latin *āverruncat*

6. This religious terminus technicus [in the form *auencat*; cf. also *adtruncat* 'avertit, alienat'] is significantly glossed by 'eradicat, eruncat.' I derive the word from the phrase *ā ver(e) runcare* = 'ab arce runcare' ('to weed'), cf. in general the Umbrian rite of *urbis lustratio* (see Buecheler, *Umbrica*, 42 seq.). The rooting up of *gramina* from the *arx* (see § 4, Pliny, *l.c.*) to carry into the enemies' country was a symbolic petition "to weed from the land" (§ 5 a), unless the phrase "to

weed from the door" grew up in private life, with *ver* : *vero*—*porta*. An instructive parallel is furnished by Shakespeare's usage of 'to weed.'

A. Of Calamities and Adversaries

7. Cato, *agr.* 141, 2 (in an *agri lustratio*), Mars pater—calamitates prohibessis defendas averruncesque; Gell. 5, 12, 14, in . . . diis quos placari oportet, ubi mala a nobis vel a frugibus natis amoliantur, Auruncus¹ (Varro, *ling. lat.* 7, 102 has *Averruncus*) habetur; Livy, 10, 23, 1, prodigia—quorum averruncandorum causa; Pacuvius, *trag.* 236, possum ego istam capite cladem averruncassere; cf. 2 *Hen. VI*, i, 3, 102, So, one by one, will weed them (= enemies) all at last; *Rich. III*, i, 3, 123, a weeder-out of his adversaries; *Rich. II*, ii, 3, 167, the caterpillars of the commonwealth, Which I had sworn to weed.

B. Of Feelings

8. *Cor.* iv, 5, 108, Each word thou hast spoken has weeded from my heart A root of ancient envy; *Fulg. serm. antiq.*, 51, averruncassit deus tam aricinas (= testeas vel argilleas) hominum mentes (*Thes.*, 2, 636, 24); Pacuvius, *trag.* 112, di monerint meliora atque amentiam averruncassint tuam (= Lucil. 541, verbo 'atque' omitted)—proverbial in Arnobius, Ambrosius, cited ap. *Thes.*, ib., 1316, 57 sq.); Livy, 8, 6, 11, placuit averruncandae deum irae victimas caedi; *L. L. Lost*, v, 2, 857, weed this wormwood from your fruitful brain; *T. G. Verona*, iii, 2, 49, but say this weed her love for Valentine, It follows not that she will love Sir Thurio.

C

9. In *Meas. for Meas.* iii, 2, 284, twice treble shame on Angelo, To weed my vice and let his grow, 'to weed' is used most generally for 'to drive out, drive off, expel,' yet in a context that leaves the literal meaning perfectly clear. In Latin, *averruncare* exhibits nowhere a context quite so literal — nor a meaning more generalized.

II. SKR. *çū-nyá-s* 'EMPTY,' AV. *sū-ra-* 'HOLE, LACUNA,' LAT. *cuniculum* 'BURROW'

10. I derive *çū-nyá-s* from a root *ķew-* 'fodere, caedere,' and find it a formation generally comparable with *εῦνις* 'orbus' : *ēw-*. Cf. the regular participial formation in *çū-na-m* 'emptiness, inopia.' A further cognate in *çū-la-s* 'spit,

¹ In *Au-runcus* I see the *au-* of *aufugio*, *aufero*: the derivation from *A-verro* (Buecheler-Usener, in the latter's *Götternamen*, 9) 'off-sweeper' is very complicated.

stake.' In the long run, *kēw-* will hardly be kept apart from *kōw-*, the root of Germ. *hauen*.¹ The variation of guttural may be ascribed to some proethnic influence upon *kōw-* of the roots to which Skr. *çásati* 'caedit' or *çākhā* 'branch, bough' belong. My personal point of view, however, about the variation *k/k* is, in general, like Hirt's (*BB.* 24, 290, II; cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* 2², I, p. 474), and I specifically assume a guttural articulation, when group-homogeneity did not interrupt, to conform to the vocalic environment; cf. the tripartite Greek treatment of *kʷ* (see *CR.* 13, 398).

11. Cognate with *sū-ra-* and *çūnyá-s* is Lat. *cūni-culus* (? with *ū* shortened before the accent, see Fay, *IF.* 26, 32 sq.) 'cony' = 'hole-dweller.' It may be that the cony was introduced from Spain, as Varro, *r. r.* 3, 12, 6, asserted, but that does not prove that a Latin name was not given to the cony, while *cūniculum* 'little hole,' early employed of siege-mines, may be prior to *cuniculus* 'cony.'

III. AVESTAN *āða* 'DIXIT'

12. The equation of Av. *āða* with Skr. *āha* (see, *e.g.*, Bartholomae, *Wtbh.* 55) is effected by positing an Indo-Iranian root *adh-*, in further support whereof *āttha* (Brāh.) = 'ais' has been pleaded. This evidence, as Wackernagel (*ai. Gram.* I, § 217, a, fn.) has shown ("*āttha* mid. Ind. from **āktha*"), is not conclusive. Further, the Av. *ā* may be explained in several ways as secondary. 1° Assuming a root *aĝh-* (proto-Ir. *ažh-*), its Persian form would be *ad-*, leaving us to ascribe Av. *āða* to dialectic admixture. 2° Or we may derive the conjugation stem *āðaya*, in *paiti. āðayoit* 'respondeat' from *ā-* + *dhaya-*: the root *dhe(y)-*² 'τιθέανται,' cf. *niðayeinte* 'deponuntur,' *niðayat* (act. form, cf. Lat. *fit*) 'deponitur' (see Bartholomae,

¹ This is of course the root to which Lat. *carus* 'hollow' belongs (Fay, *Stud. honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, 202 sq.); cf. for the vocalism *κῶος* 'lair' and *κῶα· ἐνέχυπα*, *i.e.* 'cautious.'

² The following evidence for *dhe(y)* rather than *dhe* is offered: stem *dhey-ye-* in *θελω*; stem *dhey-ye-* in Skr. *dhiyātē* 'fit'; *dhey-(y)e-* or *dhey-(y)e-* in Lat. *au-dio, con-dio*; stem *dhi-ye-* in *κεθλω*; cf. the stem *d(h)y-* in Av. *vī-dīšā-* 'generosity:' the "root" *dā-*.

Gr. Ir. Phil. 1, p. 83, 11). For the sense as a verb of saying, cf. Skr. *abhi + dhā* 'narrare,' Av. *paiti. dā* 'nuntiare' (jurid.), and Lat. *ēdit* 'narrat, nuntiat.'¹ This *ādāya-*, alongside of **āza-* (: Skr. *āha*), would account for the deflection of **āza* 'dixit' to *āda*. 3° Or **āza* was deflected to *āda*² under the influence of *gāda-* 'rogare,' *vāda-* 'dicere, recitare.'

13. If the evidence of *āda* and *āttha* does not, upon examination, yield proof of Ind.-Ir. *adh-*, the Hesychian gloss *ῆχανεν· εἰπεν* just as little proves a root *aḡh-* (see Solmsen, *KZ.* 39, 219, who fails to mention, in justification of *ῆχανεν· εἰπεν*, Lat. *hiscere* 'loqui'). But the root *aḡh-* does suit *ἀχέειν* (*Hym. Hom. Dem.* 479, wilfully emended to *χανεῖν*) and Lat. *adagium, aio, (prodigium)*³ unless, as Solmsen contends, their root was *ag-*. Cf. *gratias agere* = 'danksagen' (Lattmann, *Woch. kl. Phil.* 1910, p. 899). The phonetics comes out right if we assume the flexion *agyo agyes agyet*, etc., whence *aio agis agit*, etc.; also see § 32.

¹ If the "root" *ēdo-* 'accipere' (: *ēδει* 'eats') can be regarded as a compound of *ē* + *do* (cf. Brugmann, ap. Prellwitz, s.v. *ēδω*, and note the schwa-vowel in the Orphic word *ωὐδόιος* = *ωμηστής*; also in the analysis of Lat. *hērēd-*, Skr. *dāyādā-s* the recognition of *ēd-* as 'accipiens,' *Kvg.* § 370): Skr. *ā* + *dā-*, we might suppose that Lat. *ēde* (impv.), with an original sense *quasi* 'hersetze,' passed to something like 'depone' (tutis auribus, in rimosa aure, Horace), whence at last 'narra.' Thus *ēde-* (not from **exde-*): Av. *ādāya-* is an admissible comparison.

² As for the physiological contact, note how Germans, unaccustomed to our English *ā*-sound, turn *either* into *eizer*.

³ But not *indigetare*, which I would explain after Klausen (ap. Roscher, *Lex.* p. 136, 3) as 'digidis invocare.' Ambrosch (*ib.* 155, 52) does well to start with Macrobius, *Sat.* 1, 17, 15, *virgines vestales ita indigitant, Apollo Medice, Apollo Paean;* and Steudings depreciation of this passage (*ib.* 167, 45) is quite unjustified. No matter if Apollo's name was omitted in the Pompilian Indigitamenta (*ib.* 153, 19), who shall say that in some part of their liturgy the Vestals did not tell off his attributes with their fingers, as on a rosary? The Indigitamenta were liturgical formulae, containing names and prayers — why names and not prayers? why prayers and not names? why a thousand attempts, beyond the reach of all evidence, at exclusive classifications? — but the redaction of these in writing to secure preservation does not imply that there were not earlier or simpler groupings, told off on the fingers to secure a proper number of repetitions — as in the case of the triple text of the Arval Song — or a proper count of the groups, for the Roman gods were grouped. Formally, *indigetes* is a deverbative, after some crude thought process like this, viz.: if *homines locuplētare = h. locuplētes facere*, then *deos indigētare = deos indigētes (facere)*. Further, cf. the verbs in *-itare* formed on *dives, caespes, sospes* (Juno Sospita), *hospes, miles, veles*.

14. Nothing conclusive can be cited for either form, but *āgh-* (*agh-*) has beside it the rhyme root *swāgh-* ‘vocare, sonare’ (see cognates ap. Prellwitz, *s.v.* ἡχή), attested by Lith. *svagēti* ‘sonare;’ and *sw-āgh-*, as *āχω* (cf. Ark. *fanχos*, nom. prop.) by its sense of ‘echo’ suggests, is a compound of *sw-* ‘co-’ (: O Bulg. *sū-* ‘co-’) + *āgh-* ‘loqui.’ Thus *āχω* is ‘quae col-loquitur.’ That the simplex should mean ‘loqui,’ while *sw-āgh-* means ‘sonare, exclamare’ need cause no stumbling, for *λάσκει* (: loquitur) unites all three senses.¹

IV. THE ROOTS *nēgh-/nēk-* ‘VINCIRE; FIGERE’

15. *Formal postulates and assumptions:* 1° That the palatal *gh* may vary in this root with the plain guttural *gh* (see Hirt, ap. § 10); — 2° That, in addition to the more normal gradation stages there was a “metathetic” stage, *engh-*² (? with *e-* as in *ēθελω*, § 36), which might by loss of aspiration yield *enḡ-* (Brugmann, *Kvg.*, § 261, 6), whence, by retroaction, *nēḡ-* beside *nēgh*; — 3° That the parallel root *ēgh-* ‘vincire’ (v. Walde, *s.v.* *ango*; Fick-Stokes, pp. 14–15, *s.vv.* *ango* and *oktos*) arose from the composition of orthotone verb forms (Brugmann, *l.s.c.*, § 42, 4, c) of *nēgh-* with the preverb *en-*, accentually reduced to *ṇ*. Thus *āνwγa* ‘iniunxi’ (§ 32), from *ṇ-nōg-ṇ*, was misdivided *ṇṇ-ōg-ṇ*, like Eng. *an adder* for *a nadder* (see § 34); — 4° That initial *a* in Sanskrit, or even in the primitive speech, yielded *a* (cf. Pedersen, *KZ.* 36, 85).

16. As attests for the root *nēgh-/nēgh*, *ēgh-/ēgh-* I first

¹ I suspect a good many other roots with initial *sw-/w-/s-* of being compounds of *su-* ‘with;’ see *e.g.* on Skr. *sv-ājate* (§ 16, 4°) ‘com-plectitur,’ and cf. my analysis (*AJP.* 31, 419) of *sw-eks-[s]thos* ‘6th’ as ‘co-ex-stans.’ Note also Skr. *sv-apiti* ‘sōpit,’ from *su-* + the root of Lat. *apere* ‘ligare’ (cf. *somno* (*re-*)vinctus, Ennius, *Livy*; *sopor* complectitur *artus*, *Aen.*; Oft in the stilly night | Ere slumber’s *chain* hath *bound* me, Tom Moore). The “prosthetic” (?) *v-* of Skr. *v-dñcati* ‘swerves’: *dñcati* ‘bends’ may be a (merely) intensive use of *s]w-* ‘co-’ in composition (cf. Lat. *con-*; and on O Bulg. *su-v-qza* ‘copulum,’ § 16, 2°). In fine, *sw-ādu-* ‘sweet,’ in Lat. *suā[d]v-is*, may be a compound of *su-* ‘good’ + *ādu-*: *edit*, with a secondary *ā* to match schwa-forms, like the *a* of *ώμαδος* (see § 12, fn.; and note that according to § 15, 4° initial *a-* tended to *a* in the primitive speech).

² I take it for granted that every reader knows that the nasals before (? after) gutturals are homorganic, and it seems to me a needless pedantry to indicate that fact by diacritic marks.

present a brief table consisting in part of words to be subsequently studied in more detail. 1°, Grade *n*ōgh-/n)ōg-:—*νωχελῆς* ('vincit' whence) 'piger' (v. Fay, *AJP*. 21, 198; cf. O Bulg. *v-ęzéti* 'haerere,' W Russ. *vyaž* 'swamp' = "worin man stecken bleibt"), Skr. *sám anāha* 'co-(i)niunxi,' Av. *āxsti-š*¹ 'pax, foedus,' *āxsta* 'compacta, pacata.'—2°, Grade *negh-/engh-*:—Skr. *náhyati* 'nectit' (v. § 18), *véξas* · *τὰ στρῶματα*, O Bulg. *v-ęzati* 'vincire,' *qza/v-ęza* 'vinculum,' cf. *su-v-ęza*, which probably reveals the source of the prosthetic *v-* (v. Brugmann, *Gr.*² 1, 495, anm. 1), which may have been proethnic, i.e. *v-qza* from [s]w-ongh- (§ 14, fn.).—3°, Grade *əngh-/əngh-*: Lat. *angit* 'schnürt zusammen,' *anguis* (:əngh-w-is) 'constrictor,' *ἄγγελος*,² originally 'attaché,' with the same amelioration of sense found in Fr. *ambassadeur*: Gallic *ambactus* 'servus.'—4°, Grade *eg(h)-/og(h)-/ng(h)-*:—Av. *ašta-* *ašti-š* 'nuntius;' *axti-š* 'leiden, schmerz, krankheit,' *ažana-* 'krankheit,' Lat. *egestas* 'paupertas;' *ōχavov* (unless from *soğh-*³) 'band,' *ōχua* · *πόρπημα*, *ōχlos* 'multitudo' (cf. Eng. *band* = troop)—unless: Skr. *sáhas-* 'vis' (cf. *sahás-ra-m* 'multitudo').⁴ Here I put *ěχis* 'snake' (rather from *egh-* than from *egh-*, as Av. *aži-š* [with ſ, not z] seems to show) and *ōphis*, the latter from *oghwis* (see § 31), cf. *anguis* from *əngh-wi-s*. From the grade *eg-/negh-* Osc. *egmo* 'negotium': Lat. *neg-ōtium*. From *eg-* (or *ng?*) Skr. *sv-aj-ate* *com-plectitur* (on *s(w)* = *co*- see § 14, fn.): Lith. *seg iù* 'fibulo.'—5°, Grade *s)nā-^xg-*:—Skr. *nāga-s* 'snake,' *pan-naga-s*⁵ 'snake' (lit. 'foot-binding'): Eng. *snake*.

¹ Here and elsewhere in this list forms from *nek-* are indistinguishable from forms belonging to *negh-*.

² Lith. *algis* 'angelus summorum deorum' began by meaning something like 'Dienstboten': (*algù* 'Lohn') and does not belong here.

³ It seems to be taken for granted that all the forms connectible with *έχω* come from a single root. Without now going into details I note that, though many of the forms properly and simply derive from *segħ-* 'potiri,' others admirably suit the root *egħ-* 'vincere,' cf. for the sense *apere* 'to bind': *apisci* 'to obtain.' Cf. with movable *s(w)*- (§ 14, fn.). O Ir. *sén* 'snare' from *segno-* (Fick-Stokes, p. 297): O Bulg. *su-v-q-za*.

⁴ The verb *ōχλεῖν* admits of the definition 'to tug' (i.e. 'pull along with a band, use a tug') — as *μοχλεῖν* means 'to use a lever.'

⁵ Cf. Gadow's *Amphibia and Reptiles*, p. 614, where it is remarked of the

17. There seems no good reason for doubting that the root *s)nēgh-* ‘vincire’ is the extension of the root *s*nē- ‘vincire, nēre’ by a determinative (cf. *νᾶ-χεις* = Lat. *nā-s*): cf. also *nē-dh-* in Lat. *nōdus* : *νή-θω* ‘I spin.’ So, alongside of *s)nēgh-* I would put the root *nēk* ‘nectere,’ for which I cite — 6°, Grade *nēk-/ēnk-/ənk-* : — Goth. *nēhw*¹/*nēhwa* ‘prope’ (i.e. ‘iuxta,’ but cf. *ligatus* = ‘adjoining’ and *necessitas angusta* ‘near relationship’), *ἀνγκαῖοι* = *necessarii* (i.e. ‘coniuncti’), cf. O Bulg. *аžika* (: *enḡ-*) ‘consanguineus’; *ἀν-άγκη* ‘constraint, torture’ (see § 42), *necesse* (loc. plur. in *-es-si*) = ‘in bonds’² (Fay, *TAPA*, 37, 9 sq.), O Ir. *écen* ‘necessitas’ *écess* ‘poeta’ (i.e. ‘qui pangit’), cf. (Perso-?)Skr. *bandin-* ‘poeta’ from ‘binder,’ Gr. *ῥάψῳδος*, Lat. *vincta oratio* = ‘poetry.’

18. Minute regard solely to the testimony of Skr. *nāhyati* ‘necnit’ made Wackernagel (*ai. Gram.* I, 217, a, anm.) decide that it was derived from a “root” *neḡh-*, and not from a root *nedh-*. In the Slavic languages, O Bulg. *nīza* ‘infigo,’ *prono-**ziti* ‘perfodere’ also attest a root *neḡh-* ‘figere,’ cf. Slavic *enz-* ‘vincire,’ cognates of which are cited in § 16, 2°. Are these different roots? And if the same root, which sense is the earlier? Let us define quite concretely by ‘to tie’ and ‘to peg,’ and ask whether homophonous roots with these meanings constitute in reality but a single root. My answer will be that they do, and a sufficient reason for my answer is that another root indubitably attests both meanings, and this is the root of *πάσσαλος* ‘a peg,’ on the one hand, but Skr. *pāq-* ‘a lace, tie,’ on the other. The Latinist, studying *pango*, *paco*, and their kin would say that the original sense was ‘figo,’ but the Indo-Iranian scholar, confronted with isolated

American black snake: “It does not twine itself around the legs, *as is commonly supposed!*”

¹ With *w* a samdhi-form of *u*, the deictic locatival (v. Brugmann, *Gr.* 2², 1, p. 248). There is no kinship between *nēhw* and *ἔγγυς* (pace Hirt, *AbL*, § 635), which is a compound and means ‘at hand’ (Fay, *AJP*, 31, 416), cf. also *μεση-**γύ(s)*, with *-γύ* by irradiation from *ἔγγυς*, unless ‘mid-hand’ was the original sense.

² The construction ‘*mihi necesse est de me ipso dicere*’ is substantially identical with *ὑμῖν ἐν ἀνάγκῃ ἐστὶ βουλεύσασθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ* (Lysias, *κατ’ Ἀνδοκ.* 8), see § 43 and fn.

páç- pāçā-s 'vinculum' and the moribund Avestan root *pas-* 'vincere,' must decide for 'necto.'

19. The obvious solution of the difficulty is to say that the root *pēk-/pek¹/pāk-* meant 'to fasten,' and that *πάσσαλος* on the one hand and Skr. *paç-* on the other have developed from it. As I personally think, some concrete noun like 'peg' or 'tie' started the "root" on its way. But this aside, the root seems to have meant "to tie" rather than "to peg," and that on the evidence of Skr. *paç-* Av. *pas-*; — not because Sanskrit and Avestan emerge as literatures so long before Latin, say, but because of the isolation of *paç-* already mentioned, and ultimately because stone hatchets were lashed to their handles long before boring tools developed to the point of allowing them also to be pegged on. But we must not forget that the process of lashing a stone axe to its handle involved grooving or splitting the handle, and that the axe itself was 'pegged' into the handle; nor that a verb, especially a denominative, describing the process of 'helving' was liable to be allocated to one or more of the several ideas of 'splitting, lashing, pegging' (see Meringer, *Woch. kl. Phil.*, 1910, 565–566). Further note the generalization whereby Lat. *immolare* grew to mean 'sacrifice,' and Skr. *badhnāti* 'binds' grew to mean 'offert, caedit.' Thus Lat. *victima* (and Germ. *weihen*) may be cognate with *vincit* 'binds.' Cf. Lat. *sacer* : *sancit* '*binds' *TAPA.* 37, 15.

20. It was doubtless in technical usage that the vague 'to fasten' replaced the graphic 'to tie.' The brickmason "ties" ²

¹ The ē-vocalism is proved by Goth. *ga-fēh-aba* 'apt,' and particularly, for me, by Lat. *pecus*, originally of animals *ties up* for domestication (cf. Lith. *bandā* 'pecus,' and Aratus, ap. Cic. *N.D.* 2, 159, *vinctum domitumque iuvencum* [§ 48a]), and so δαμάζει 'domesticates': δέμος ('the wattled') house' attests. — For this sense of Skr. *pāçu-* see Grassmann, *Wb. z. RV.*, s.v.; and of δέμος, Walde, s.v. *domus*. I am fresh from a rural summer where the family milch-cow was always kept tied by the family cabin (in Texas called "staking"). In local usage (U.S.) *tie-up* is the name of that part of a barn used for cow-stalls. The original sense of -δέμος lingers on in the Aeschylean compound λεπτοδέμοις (*πελσμασι*) 'fine-plaited (cables),' as well as in δέμοι (Herod.) of layers of brick (cf. *tie-course*, § 20).

² German brickburners similarly employ *schnur* to designate "reihe von ziegeln, wie sie in den brennofen gesetzt wird."

his wall after a certain number of lengthwise courses by a crosswise course, and the carpenter uses 'tie-beams' and 'tie-bolts.' For the same metaphor in Greek and Latin, cf. Thuc. 2, 75, *σύνδεσμος ἦν . . . τὰ ξύλα*; Caes. *B. C.* 2, 10, 3, *tigna . . . laminis clavisque religant*; *ib.* 2, 6, 2, *ferreis manibus iniectis navem religarant*.

21. The reverse development from 'figere' to 'nectere' is harder to substantiate, for Fr. *attacher* [: Eng. *tack*, as explained by Diez and Littré (Skeat and Kluge)] seems more likely, on the whole, to be cognate with *tactus*. But Eng. *tack* has Germanic cognates, *e.g.*, E Fries. *tak* 'twig, bough,' that look toward the sense of 'nectere.' However, the development from 'tine, prong, branch' (of antlers) to 'branch' (of a tree) is too obvious to let us believe that 'nectere' was the original sense; cf. Lat. *clavula* 'scion, graft' (originally 'little tine, peg'), *clavicularia* 'tendril.'¹

21a. The generalization of the concrete toward the abstract is possibly attested, also, by Eng. *clench/clinch*. True, the Oxford Dictionary gives as the original definition "to make to stick firmly together, to rivet," but the derivation from the onomatopoetic "root" of *clink* seems to me certain — save for the large number of etymologists who are genuinely pained at the thought of reaching back to the phonic germ of a word. But when we say 'to *clinch* a rivet,' *i.e.* to make it *clink* in the act of bradding its head, I seem to myself to see the word in its swaddling clothes. Nor is this to overlook the older Germanic forms ["*klankjan*"], *chlankhan*, *klenken*, *chlenkan* = *conserere*, *knüpfen*, *binden*, *schlingen*" (Schade), but I think the current English locution "to *clench* (*clinch*) a knot" (cf. *clinch* = knot in a rope, nautical) may go back far enough in Germanic history to account for the development of a general sense like 'knüpfen.' We cannot date metaphors con-

¹ Be it remarked in passing that *tack*, Ger. *Zacke*, belong with *δάκνει* 'bites,' orig. = 'tooth,' perhaps. So Skr. *daçā* 'fringe' may be a metaphor from the "fringe" of the teeth—unless from a string of teeth worn as a primitive necklace; cf. Fr. *dentelle* and *point* = 'lace.' Gr. *δοκός* '*tooth' was applied, I surmise, to projecting rafter ends, as in the wooden construction whence proceeded the Doric temple, with its "triglyphs"; and *δοκός* 'rafter' came by synecdoche from *δοκός* '*tooth.'

clusively, but if the sense of Eng. *knop/knob* is more original than the sense of Germ. *knüpfen*, by the same token Eng. *clinch* = 'knot' (a metaphor from the rivet) may be prior in sense to OHG. *chlankhan* 'conserere.' It is a question of passing from 'pegged' to 'tied,' as Aeschylus did in *Prom.* 113, *δεσμοῖς* (πεπασσαλευμένος). Indeed, throughout the *Prometheus* there is confusion of 'nailing' and 'binding'; cf. also *γόμφοι*· *δεσμά*, *σύνδεσμος*.

22. With this evidence before us, O Bulg. *niza* 'figo' and Skr. *náhyati* 'nectit' may be referred to a root *negh-* 'nectere; figere,' with the likelihood that, on the whole, 'figere' developed out of 'nectere.'

23. A grade *neg-* is further found in the Sanskrit tautological complex *yu-naj-mi* 'iungo' (see Fay, *AJP.* 26, 399).¹ I am prepared for the objection that *yu-náj-mi* has a derivative *yugá-m*, with a *g* not deducible from *-naj-*, but a fixed constituent of the root. Let us shift the analysis to Skr. *pi-mç-áti* 'pingit' (on which see the last footnote), compounded of *pi-* 'point' + *n(e)k-* (: *negh-*), and ask what is the relation of *piñk-* (in *πικρός*): *pinek-* in *pi-mç-áti*. The relation is a mere accident, perhaps, for *πικρός* may have got its *kr* by irradiation from the *kr* found in Lat. *ācer* 'sour;' in a word, the "root" *s)þey-* 'point' has got a *þ* from *ək-* 'point' (in Lat.

¹ I am not unaware of the frigidity with which this attempt to explain the nasal verb flexion from tautological compounds, or complexes, has been received, but of its general reasonableness I am more convinced as I study the nasal verbs further. Let us apply it, for instance, to the three Latin verbs *pangit*, *pingit*, *pungit* = 'fastens, paints, pricks.' To begin with *pu-ŋg-it*, a weak-grade root *pu-* 'tundere' is hardly to be questioned (cf. Walde, s.v. *puteus putus*), which, combined with *negh-* 'figere,' yields the proper sense for *pu-ŋg-it*. As for *pi-ŋg-it*, a stem *s)pi-/s)þpi-* 'pointed' is quite certain (cf. Walde, s.v. *pinna*), and the interpretation of *pi-ŋg-it* (with *ŋg*: *negh-*) as 'point-pricks' (i.e. 'tattoos,' see Fay, *AJP.* 21, 198) is perfectly apt. As for *pa-ŋg-it*, we may start either with *s)þp(y)-* (Lat. *spí-na*), or with *þp(w)-* (Lat. *pūvit/pavit* 'strikes'), reduced to *s)þp-* (cf. *στάθη* 'striker') and combined with *negh-*. — I must add in frankness that personally I regard *s)þey-* and *s)þow-* as correlatives (see *AJP.* 26, 188, § 25). But whether my resolution of the phonetic difficulty be adjudged correct or not (see op. cit. 25, 371, d), parallel forms with *i/u* alternation present a problem for solution, as e.g. Skr. *lesṭu-s/lostā-s* 'clod.' O Eng. *lytel*: Goth. *leitils*, *στίφος* 'mass': *στήφει* 'masses' (cf. the bases *lēy-/lēw-* *peik-/peuk-* *għej-/għew-* in Walde, s.vv. *luo pugil faux*; and in general Noreen, *Urgerm. Lautl.* § 22).

acus 'needle'). For *yug-*, if I believed in the unlimited algebraic treatment of the gradation series, I might speak of *yu-* + the reduced grade of *eg(h)* 'iungere' (§ 16, 4°), but I prefer rather to say that upon some proethnic derivative of the root of Skr. *yāuti* 'iungit,' let us say p. ptc. **yū-tó-s*, the influence of some derivative of *ēg(h)-*, let us say *āktó-s* (cf. Av. *āxšta*, § 16, 1°) made itself felt, whence *yū(k)tó-s* — and that before the subsequent parasitic differentiation of palatal from pure guttural was established (§ 15, 1°).

24. For the root-stage *nēk-* as many as three separate roots have been set up, defined as (1) 'adipisci' (cf. Lat. *nac-tus*), (2) 'necare' (cf. *nocet*), (3) 'vincire' (in Lat. *nec-t-it* [if not from *ne-gh-t-it*], *necessitas*, § 17). That all these meanings belong to one root only is for me beyond question. By simply assuming the use of a 'trag-riemen' (v. *TAPA*. 37, 9), designated by a noun *nēk-* 'strap,' I showed how to unite (1) and (3). But we would also come out for (2), e.g. if *νεκ-ρός* = ('morte) vinctus.'

25. But we come out more simply even by positing a noun *nēk-* 'snare,' used by a hunting and trapping folk, whence (1) 'to snare game' (cf. Cicero, *N.D.* 2, 161, *feras nancisci-mur venando*) — the 'snare' being liable to use also as a 'trag-riemen;' (2) 'to strangle with a snare, kill;' (3) 'to bind with a snare, fasten.' Other meanings, as in *vakτός* 'compact, solid,' come from binding with a string, i.e. 'pressing.' About *πτήγνυμι* and its sept (see §§ 18, 19) the general sense of 'solidify' has grown up. Observe also the very strict, if limited, sense of 'compression' in the sentence 'Miss Blank *laces*.'

V. DERIVATIVES OF THE ROOT *nēgh-/ēgh-*

i. Lat. *anguis* : *έχις*, *όφις*

25a. The later standard authorities deny the relation of *anguis* to *έχις* and *όφις*, though Walde presents a curiously complicated scheme whereby the words have become intertangled. But if the root was *nēgh-*, with the various grades exhibited above (§ 16), and with alternation of palatal and

guttural (§ 15, 1°), the difficulties as to the nasal (§ 15, 3°) and the vowels disappear. There is still a difficulty as to the guttural, for χ on the face of it is either a pure guttural or a palatal—certainly a palatal if $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\iota\varsigma$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\hat{\iota}\nu\varsigma$ ‘hedgehog’ are cognate (see § 28)—while *anguis* and $\delta\phi\iota\varsigma$ seem to show a velar. Skr. *ahī-s* and Av. *aži-š* make either for a velar or a pure guttural, while Arm. *iž* is said to represent—unless it is a borrowed word (cf. Scheftelowitz, *BB.* 28, 291)—*ēgʷhi-* or *ēghi-*.

25b. We save trouble of course by equating $\delta\phi\iota\varsigma$ = Skr. *ahi-s* = Av. *aži-š* : Arm. *iž*. But we also make trouble. We lose the etymology of these words, because we cannot thus trace their derivation. We do not get the etymology of Lat. *domus* by saying it equals $\delta\delta\mu\o\varsigma$, we only get its etymology when we account for the meaning ‘house’ (§ 19, fn. 1).

26. To my mind Lat. *anguis* properly means ‘constrictor,’ and belongs with *angit* ‘binds’ (so Fick-Stokes, p. 15). I also follow Fick (1⁴, 504) in deriving Lat. *natrix*, Germ. *natter*, from the root *s*ne- ‘nere’ (cf. above, § 16, 5°, on Eng. *snake*. Skr. *pan-naga-s* : *snē-g-*). In his translation of *AV*, 10, 4, 10; 15, etc. Professor Whitney rendered *svajá-* (i.e. *sv-ajá-*, see § 16, 4°) by ‘constrictor.’

27. There are two different ways in which the sense of ‘constrictor’ may have developed, (1) from the snake’s own coils, cf. Lat. *nodi* and *nexus*, ultimately cognate with the root of *snake* and of *anguis*, both meaning ‘coils;’ *convolvens* and *tortus*, both describing the snake’s coiling motions; $\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\omega\ldots\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\sigma\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\varsigma\omega\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\iota\eta\acute{\epsilon}$ (X 95)¹; (2) from its coils about its prey. Nor is it necessary to have in mind the giant Pythons as Grassmann (*Wtbch. z. RV.* s.v. *ahī-s*) did, for many of the smaller snakes constrict their prey, to be-

¹ Shakespearean examples: *As You Like It*, iv, 3, 109, About his neck | A . . . snake had *wreathed* itself; *rolled* = coiled, 2 *Hen. VI*, iii, 1, 228, *T. And.* ii, 3, 13; cf. *ib.* ii, 3, 35, Even as the adder when she doth *unroll* | To do some fatal execution, cf. Vergil, *G.* 3, 423, cum mediī *nexus* extremaeque agmina caudae | *solvuntur*, tardosque trahit sinus ultimus orbis, etc. Certain tree snakes “let themselves fall down from considerable heights, *coiling* body and tail like a watch spring, and alighting on the ground upon the *spiral*, which breaks the fall” (Gadow, op. cit. p. 619).

numb the living creatures before swallowing them.¹ It is not impossible that the snake, the constrictor, was named before the verb came to mean 'to bind' —conceived, that is, as a 'thong' or 'lash,' before the verb took on the sense of 'nectere.' But whether that be true or no, the following words, to say nothing of the Furies' snaky hair, reveal a few of the objects likened to snakes: *anguilla* (= 'eel'), glossed by "est quâ coercentur in scholis pueri, quae vulgo *scutica* dicitur" (cf. Eng. 'whip-snake'); *an genus flagelli*; Skr. *māla-dhāna-*, said to be the name of a snake, is attested as the name of a sort of 'schlingpflanze'² (*māla-* : *mālā* 'wreath'). The rope-like shape of the snake gives point to the proverb in Petronius' 'colubra *restem* non parit.'³ The Italian snake called *bova* (*boa*) by Pliny — for which the original sense was, I surmise, merely 'leather strap,' cf. *βοεύς*, Skr. *gāvas* (see § 52, fn.) and Plautine *boves* (*Asin.* 34) = 'straps of cowhide' — has given a name to a rope-like piece of woman's neckwear. Last I note *σκυτάλη*, a name applied to rod-like snakes, which suggests Moses and Aaron and the snake-turning rods of the Egyptian conjurers.

28. So much by way of illustration of the notandum 'quae se nectit.' The cognation of *ἔχειν* with *ἔχινος*, if granted, seems to demand a very different notandum, viz.: "der stechende" (so Prellwitz), and no reader of Shakespeare would question "stinging" as an epithet for *snake*. But it may be shown, I think, that 'convolvens' is not only an apt description of the *hedgehog*, but that, among the Greeks and Romans, it was the description, *par excellence*. Let us begin with the proverb, cited from Archilochus (118), and probably the earliest mention of the hedgehog in a European litera-

¹ Cf. Gadow, op. cit. p. 605, "The prey (a lizard or mouse) is caught by the head and further secured by several *turns* of the body of the captor, whose tail is then turned forwards, round the head of the victim, so as to form a kind of *knot*;" also pp. 613, 616, 621, et al.

² Here note Germ. *schlange* which, generally explained as "die schleicherin," may perhaps mean 'quae se flectit': OHG. *slingen* 'flechten.' — The garter-snake seems to have been named from his color.

³ Is *colubra* a cognate of *cōlum*, glossed by *σχουρίον* = 'restis'? Cf. the gloss *colus* 'virga quae per cocleam volvitur.'

ture: *πόλλα' οἰδ' ἀλώπηξ, ἀλλ' ἔχινος ἐν μέγα, echoed by Ion, ap. Athen. 3, 91, E, ἀλλ' ἐν τε χέρσῳ τὰς λέοντος γνεσα | η τὰς ἔχινον μᾶλλον οἰζυρὰς τέχνας.* What this trick was is clear from Pliny, *N.H.* 8, 133, *irenacii . . . volutati supra . . . poma . . . ubi vero sensere venantem . . . convolvuntur* in formam pilae, ne quid comprehendi possit praeter aculeos. Cf. Nemes. 57, *implicitumque sinu* spinosi corporis *erem.* Thus we see that 'coiling' is as suitable an epithet for the hedgehog as for the *snake*.¹

29. The phonetic result from the comparison *ĕχις* : *ĕχινος* is the establishment of *e᷑gh-* as one root form, beside which a plain guttural stage *egh-* is admissible without more ado (§ 15, 1). But does *anguis* show a third variety, a labialized velar? I am decidedly of the conviction that it does not, but that we have to start with *ən᷑gh-w-is.* The stem *ən᷑gh-w-* is nothing but the stem of Skr. *amhú-* (in *amhu-bheda*- 'eng-spaltig') used as a basis for further suffixation, cf. *ən᷑gh-wo-*, attested in Lat. *angi-portus*, though this may represent *ən᷑gh-i-* 'direct,' and is not so likely to represent *ən᷑gh-u-* 'direct' (pace Brugmann, *Gr.* 2², 1, p. 177). Gothic *aggwus* is contaminated from **aggu-z* and **aggwaz* (see Zupitza, ap. Brugmann, *ib.* 1², p. 928, fn.). Lat. *anguis* is but a feminine (cf. Skr. *pūrvī* fem. to *pūrū-s* 'πολύς'; *πολλο-* from *πολ[F]-yό-*) to the stem *ən᷑ghū-*.

30. I note in passing that all Lat. *u*-adjectives have become *-vi*-adjectives, starting with the feminine, but the extension of nominal *u*-stems by *yo*-stems, to indicate adjective function, was common (Brugmann, *ib.* § 115, b). In the German adjective flexion we have suppletion of *u*-stems from the *jā*-stems, and this also has been charged to the feminine forms. The contamination, if that is the right word, of *i*- and *u*-stems seems also indicated in the Sanskrit *āu* locatives to *i*-stems, cf. Oscan acc. in *-im* to *u*-stems, e.g. *mani-m* 'manum,' even if *castrid* (ablv.) be the continuant of **castrūd*. The co-existence of *ti*- and *tu*-stems must also be reckoned with, how-

¹ It is interesting to note the association of these two animals in an incantation in *MND.* ii, 2, 9: You spotted snakes, with double tongue, | thorny hedgehogs, be not seen.

ever minimized by von Planta (*Gram.* 2, p. 162), who fails to note that *senati* (gen. from dat. loc. of an *i*-stem?) greatly outnumbers *senatus* in earlier Latin. The locatives *humū* (Varro, *Men.* 422, 531) and *humī* may also attest *u*- and *i*-stems (cf. Skr. *ksāmi-*, fem. 'humus,' but on all these *i*-forms felt as locatives we must allow for the influence of *domi*). But *humī* = *χαμ-αι* is a perfect equation.

31. This startform for *angui*-s the 'she-narrow-one' is, *exceptis excipiendis*, valid (1) for Lith. *ang*-s, for which it is more expedient to write the base with pure guttural, *angh-w-is*, though this assumes that *-nghw-* has the treatment of *-ngʷh-*; and (2) for *ὅφις* which, in its only Homeric occurrence (and again in Hippoanax), must be read as *ὅφις* or *ὅπφις*, and that in a line where the metre would have admitted, in another position, *ὅφις* (see Schulze, *Quaest. Ep.* 431). For the Homeric *ὅφφις* (*ὅπφις*) I write a base, derived from the root *eḡh-* or *egh-*, *oḡhwi*-s, assuming for *ḡhw* a treatment analogous to the treatment of *kw* in *ἴππος*, cf. *κέπφος* as explained by Brugmann in the *Grundriss* (1², § 342). The general Greek simplification of *ὅφφις* (*ὅπφις*) to *ὅφις* seems to be an early instance of what occurred at a later date to the *proper names* *Βάκχος*/ *Βάχχος* and *Σαπφώ*/ *Σαφφώ*, viz. their reduction to *Βάχος* and *Σάφω* (see Miss Dawes, *Greek Asp.*, p. 13).¹ It is hardly necessary to add that Methymnian *ἴμβηρις* · *ἔγχελν* attests a stem *engw-* as Lat. *anguilla* attests *eng(h)w-*.²

ii. Homeric *ἄνωγα* 'iubeo'

32. Solmsen (see § 13) derived support for his root *ag-* 'loqui' from *ἄνωγα*. Granting his definition even, *γ* might be secondary in a nasal environment (§ 15, 2°; cf. Skr. *v-ag-nú-s* 'cry': *sw-āgh-* in *ṇχώ*, § 14 fn.). I would, however, define *ἄνωγα* by 'iniunxi' (cf. Eng. *enjoins* = 'orders')³ and identify

¹ The early poetical form *ἄκχος* beside *ἄχος* presents difficulties, but here we have a merely mechanical analogy *Ἄκχος*/*Ἄχος*, modelled on the intensive doubling in *(f)l(f)ακχή*, beside *(f)l(f)αχή*.

² I can but believe that in the gloss *ἀβεις* · *ἔχεις* we have our Latin verb *habes*.

³ So Lat. *iubeo* looks like the combination of the root *yu-* in Skr. *yāuti*/*yuvāti* ('bindet an') with the root *dhe-*. Skr. *yuj-*, in the simplex, reached the sense

it with that other fossilized form, Skr. *anāha* (= *co-(i)niunxi*; see § 38). Phonetically the correlation of *h* and *γ* may be the same correlation presented in Skr. *ahám* = ēγó, unless ultimately due to the alternation *ngh/ng*; and so we may account for the *g* in Lat. *agere* = 'dicere,' § 13.

33. The difficulties raised as to the tense of *ἄνωγα* (Solmsen,¹ l.s.c.; Leo Meyer, *Hdbch.* I, 197) are due to misconceptions, as an analysis of the instances reveals:² (1) All the cases of *ἄνωγας* (2d sg.) are anaphoric, *i.e.* refer to past injunctions, and 'iussisti' would be a valid rendering in every case.³ (2) The clausula *σε φράξεσθαι ἄνωγα* (5 times) always concludes a brief speech of warning, and so far as time relations go 'te cavere iussi (admonui)' is always (less so at π 312) admissible. (3) In π 405, 446, ν 364 (*ἄνωγα*) and in Ξ 105, Π 582, Ω 90 (*ἄνωγεν*) a perfect rendering is well justified; especially note I 680, where Odysseus, reporting back from Achilles, combines *ἄνωγεν* (Lang-Leaf-Myers render by 'biddeth') with *ἡπείλησεν* (*ib.* 'threateneth'). (4) In *(ε)μεθυμὸς ἄνωγεν*, Ζ 444, Ξ 195 [= Σ 426, ε 89], Σ 90, Ω 198 [*μένος καὶ θυμὸς ἄνωγεν*, cf. Lat. *mens animi*] the rendering 'my heart hath bound (enjoined) me' has yielded the inferential sense 'my heart bids (prompts)'; in σ 409 *ἄνωγε* is for 'iusserit' (fut. pf.). (5) In K 120, Ψ 345, γ 317 (*κέλομαι καὶ ἄνωγα*), π 316 the present sense seems to me very strong,

'aufragen, befehlen, iniungere.' Cf. Eng. *clench/ clinch* (§ 21) = 'affirm emphatically or conclusively; insist; ' Lat. *defigit* 'declares fixedly, firmly.'

¹ Solmsen's list of present-perfects of verbs of saying is not truly illustrative, for all save *γέγωνα*, inferential perfect, with curious shift of meaning (cf. *novi* 'I have learnt, know,' and *οἶδα* 'I have seen, know'), to *γιγνώσκω* (?), are emotional reduplications of vigorously descriptive and concrete verbs, e.g. *κέ-κληγ-α* 'I (have) bawl(ed)', or rather, 'I bawl-and-bawl.'

² I have examined only the cases listed in Gehring's index as perfects, taking it for granted that the 15 impf. uses of *ἄνωγε(ν)* are really preterites, and constituted the bridge from *ἄνωγε(ν)*, pr. pf., to *ἄνωγει*, pr. Naturally I have not followed Solmsen in treating *ἀποτρύνω καὶ ἄνωγα* as a standing formula, for the unmolested text always reads *ἀποτρύνει καὶ ἄνώγει*, nor is *κέλομαι καὶ ἄνωγα* (§ 33, 5) a standing formula.

³ Ω 670, where *ἄνωγας* = 'iusseris' (fut. pf.), constitutes no real exception; nor in σ 346 does the tense of *ἰσχανάς* require the couplet verb *ἄνωγας* to be present.

but as, in the *θυμὸς ἀνωγεν* locution, 'bids' has so naturally arisen from 'hath bound,' the reason for the extension is plain enough.¹

34. Far be it from me, however, not to admit that *ἀνωγε*, especially as in *θυμὸς ἀνωγεν*, may have started with the sense of ('co-)egit,' but the equation *ἀνωγα* = Skr. *anāha* (§ 32) seems to me to have stronger claims. The proethnic start form was *ŋ-nōgh-ŋ* (see § 15, 3°), an *en*-compound, subsequently, misdivided *ŋ-n-ōgh-ŋ*, whence the conception of a root *ēgh-*, attested by Arm. *iž* 'snake' (§ 25a), by Skr. *sám anāha* (§ 38) and by Av. *ny-āzata* 'sie schnürt, *ny-āzayen* 'iniungant, infigant' (referred by Bartholomae—*Wibch.* p. 362; *IF*. 8, 235 — to the root of *ἄγχει*). For further evidence of a long initial vowel, cf. Av. *ār̥šta* (§ 37).

iii. ἐνήνοχε and ἡνεγκε²

35. I have before now suggested that these words came from the (kindred if not) common roots *nēgh-* and *nēk-* (*TAPA*. 37, 11) and pointed out incidentally that in pairs like *ἐνήνοχε* and *ἡνεγκε*, proceeding from correlated roots where tenuis and media aspirata were found, we had the source of the aspirated perfects in Greek.

36. These roots I would now, for systematic purposes, write as *enēgh-* *enēk-*, but the question arises whether the initial *e*-, here and in all the *enek-* *ewek-* bases (Hirt, *Ablaut*, § 562 sq.) is not the (prepositional) element found in *ἐ-**θελω* (cf. Brugmann, *Kvg.* § 593, anm.); and then another question arises, whether these roots are not compounds with the preposition *en*, viz. *en-ēgh-* and *en-ēk-*, proethnically welded, as in *ἐπ-ισταμαι* *ἐπ-* is ethnically welded to its root. Thus considered *ἡν-εγκ-ον* is like *ἡπ-ιστάμην* and *-ην-οχ-ε* comparable with *ἡν-εγκ-ε*, supposing *ἐν-ήν-οχ-ε* to be unoriginal, due to recombination with *ἐν-* or to a secondary Greek reduplication. But the division *ἡ-νεγκ-ε* is far surer, with *-νεγκ-* a reduplicated aorist stem of the *ἐ-πε-φν-ε* type, cf. Lat. *na-nc-iscor*,

¹ Further note Shakespeare's *Ant. and Cleop.* i, 1, 38, I bind | On pain of punishment the world to weet (= know), — where *bind* differs little from *bid*.

² For the development of meaning, see §§ 24, 25.

with *a* for *e* from *nactus* (i.e. *nək-tós* : *nək-*). I similarly divide Skr. *ā-náñç-a*/*ā-nāç-a*, taking *ā-* for an augment of the prosthetic (prepositional) *e*-.

But in the perfect *ān-añj-a* the sense *in-unxi* favors the notion that *ān-*, if not merely analogical, is an augmented preverb *en-*.¹

iv. Av. *āxšay-* ‘pax, foedus,’ *āxsta* ‘pacata,’ *āgrə-mati-ś* ‘coniuncti-mens’

37. These words (with inorganic *x*) would seem to belong to the root laid down in *PW*.¹ (1, 567) as *ah-* (“: *nah* : : *aç* : *naç*”); further references, § 15, 3°. Note *ἀγχόνη* ‘noose.’ From ‘noosing’ came the senses of ‘hanging’ and of ‘constriction’ (§ 25), cf. Γ 371, *ἄγχε-μιν-ιμᾶς - ὑπὸ δειρήν*. With *ἄγχει* ‘prope’ cf. *iuxta* and *strictim*. The primary sense of *ἄγχει* was ‘schnürt’ (cf. Grimm’s *Wtbch.*, s.v. *schnüren*, p. 1407, 1, c : = “funiculo torquere . . . schnüren heisst auch pendere, brancher, henken, mit dem stricke umbringen”).

38. The meaning of the Skr. root *ah-* is, in spite of considerable ellipsis, perfectly transparent in *RV*. 8, 48, 5^b, *ráthām ná gávah̄ sám anāha párvāsu* = ‘ut currum (i.e. currūs articulos) lora (co(i)niungunt, ita ego) *co(i)niunxi* (vini latices) articulis (meis)² (= articulos meos vino).’

39. I interpret the *ā* of *anāha* as attesting a long vowel root *nēgh-*, also found in Av. *ny-āzata*, but see Bartholomae as cited in § 34. For the root-grade *ēg(h)-* cf. Av. *āgrə-matay-* quasi ‘coniuncti-mens,’ and for *əg-*, *ἄγνος* ‘vitex’³ (cf. *H. Hom. Merc.* 409 *καρτερὰ δεσμὰ | ἄγνον*) and *ἄγ-λ-īθει* ‘cluster or head of garlic’ (perhaps a chain of garlic-heads), assimilated

¹ The *ān-* reduplication of Sanskrit roots in *r*, e.g. *ān-ṛciś* ‘laudaverunt,’ if not exhibiting *n* dissimulated from *r* in reduplicated groups, may likewise show *en-* welded in composition; cf. Lat. *inquam*, and for the fact of suppletion of a simplex by a compound with *en-* recall that Lat. *in-cipio* is the present of *coepi*.

² For the metaphor cf. on the one hand colloquial *tanglefoot*, for whiskey; and on the other a *bracer*, colloquially used for a drink or toddy, but defined by Johnson as a ‘medicine which gives tension or tone to any part of the body.’

³ For the vocalism cf. O Bulg. *j-agnēdū* ‘pōpulus’ (Liden, *IF*. 18, 506). As the *ἄγνος* supplied withies for binding so the *ἄγνευπος* (*populus nigra* = *j-agnēndū*) furnished the Homeric wheelwright (Δ 482) with felloes (*fl̄vs* = ‘binding,’ i.e. ‘rim’: Lat. *vitex* ‘withy’). See further on *j-agnēdū* in § 55.

to $\gamma\epsilon\lambda\text{-}\gamma\bar{\iota}\theta\epsilon\varsigma$ in ending. The vocalism of our root, sans nasal, is shown in Gallic *Octodurus* (cf. Fick-Stokes, p. 15).

v. Av. *ašta*-, *ašti*- \check{s} - 'nuntius,' *axti*- \check{s} - 'angor,' Lat. *egestas*

40. For the development of sense in *ašta*-, morphologically identical with Gallic *octo*-, see on *ἄγγελος* (§ 16, 3°), further noting Skr. *yuktá-s* 'angestellt,' *ni-yukta-s* 'angestellter, beamter.' With pure guttural, *kt*, not *kt̄*, Av. *axti*- \check{s} 'angor.' For Lat. *egestas* 'angustiae, paupertas,' cf. *pauperies angusta, res angusta*, which does not seriously differ from *res egenae* (Plautus, *Cpt.* 405; *Poen.* 130; Vergil, *Aen.* 6. 91 [wherein Norden, in his *Aeneis*, vi, p. 361, conjectures an Ennian reminiscence]) I posit a stem *eg(h)es*- \check{s} . The sense of *eget* is clearly related with the sense of Av. *azah*- 'bedrägniss, noth.'

vi. Oscan *egmo*, Lat. *negōtium*(?)

41. For Osc. *egmo* 'res' (four times in the Lex Bantia, once combined with *toutico* 'publica') the rendering *negōtium* is everywhere appropriate. It would seem that *egmo* was in these instances the 'chose in action,' a sense development as in Germ. *ding*¹ (see Kluge, s.v.), Eng. *thing*. Also cf. Eng. *fixtures* 'articles of a personal nature,' and colloquial *traps*, of one's 'belongings, possessions, things.' The original sense of *egmo* may have been 'pactum': *ēg(h)*- 'nectere.' Is *negotium*—also used of a law-suit, and curiously amenable in its lexical citations to the rendering of 'engagement'—a parallel form from *neg(h)*? This surmise requires a ptc. **negotus* of one 'bound to his work,' cf. Eng. 'to bind an apprentice'—whence *negotium* = '**negoti opus*'²

vii. Irish *écen* 'necessitas': *áváγκη*, Lat. *necessa*

42. The morphological and semantic aspects of Prellwitz's derivation—"“*anank*-: *enk* : *nek*; \sqrt{neko} tragen"—are entirely insufficient. A careful examination of *áváγκη* in

¹ Was it not from legal *causa* that Fr. *chose*, etc., developed?

² Here note the gloss *nagat* (unless for *uagat*) 'vacillat, huc illuc flectitur,' cf. Eng. *bends*, derived from *band* : *bind*.

Homer should bring the conviction that, like Lat. *sedulo* (*sedulus*, *sedulitas*) and (*se curā*) *sēcurus* (*sēcuritas*), ἀνάγκη is a conflux derived from ἐν *ἄγκῃ. For the vowel assimilation whereby ἀν- has replaced ἐν, I not only compare λακάνη for λεκάνη, but I apply the principle established by J. Schmidt (*KZ*. 38, 5 sq.) that prepositions enclitically prefixed to their regimen suffer peculiar and relatively extended reduction. It is possible, however, to look upon ἀν- as a proethnic reduction of *en-* in composition (§ 34).

43. The Homeric usage of ἀνάγκη admits of the following classification: (1) dat. ἀνάγκῃ, 31 times (*Od.* 19, *Il.* 12), always at a line end except in I 429, 692; (2) ὑπ' ἀνάγκῃς, replacing ἀνάγκῃ, 3 times (*Od.* only); (3) ἀνάγκῃ, 6 times (*Od.* 1, *Il.* 5). I define -αγκη by 'bond,' whence 'constraint.' The most original contexts are (1) Σ 113 (= T 66) δαμάσαντες ἀνάγκῃ (see σ 76, below); cf. Τ 143 ἀναγκαίηφι δαμέντας; (2) ἦ μιν ἀνάγκη | ἵσχει, δ 557, ε 14, ρ 143 (of Kalypso); (3) locutions with ἄγω, to wit:

ι 98, τὸς μὲν ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆσος ἄγον κλαίοντας ἀνάγκῃ
 ξ 27, σὺν ἀγέμεν μνηστῆροις ὑπερφάλοισιν ἀνάγκῃ
 ξ 272 (= ρ 44), τὸς δ ἀναγον ζωούς σφισὶν ἐργάζεσθαι ἀνάγκῃ
 σ 76, . . . ἄγον ζώσαντες ἀνάγκῃ | δειδιότα
 χ 353, ἀλλὰ πολὺ πλέονες καὶ κρείσονες ἥγον ἀνάγκῃ
 Ι 429 (= 692), ἀνάγκη δ' οὐ τί μιν ἄξω (ἄξει).

—Of the six instances of ἀνάγκῃ (nom.) two might be replaced by ἀνάγκῃ, if = ἐν ἄγκῃ,¹ viz.: Ε 633, τίς τοι ἀνάγκῃ | πτώσειν ἐνθάδ', which is later in type (as τίς shows) than Τ 251, ἀλλὰ τί ἦ ἔριδας καὶ νείκεα νῶν ἀνάγκῃ | νεικεῖν ἀλλήλοισιν ἐναντίον; (see § 17, fn. for *necessere est*).

44. What is the form *ἄγκῃ? I derive it from *ŋkā*, a long nasal vowel grade of *nēk-* (see § 17 6°, above), or from *enkā*: the root as written *enek-* (§§ 35–36).² With *nkā*, the Celtic base

¹ Lysias (as cited above, § 17) in his ἐν ἀνάγκῃ ἔστι realizes afresh my theoretical restoration of *ἐν ἄγκῃ.

² Hirt, *Abl.* 628, gives identical reduction of *enk* and *ŋk* to *ak* in Greek, and so in all other I.-E. languages. Then we may as well suppress the theoretical *enk*-stage altogether. But the *a* of ἐν-άγκῃ may be a sporadic example of the true phonetic development of *en*.

enknā (so Fick-Stokes, p. 32; earlier *ŋknā*), whence O Ir. *écen*, is the nearest correlative.

45. For the meaning of the word **ἄγκη* we should note *δμῶες ἀναγκαῖοι* (ω 210) = 'servi vincti,' *χρεοῖ ἀναγκαῖη* (Θ 57) = 'necessitate vinciente' and *ἡμαρ ἀναγκαῖον* (Π 836) = 'dies vinciens.' For further cognates see § 17, and for a discussion of Lat. *necesse*, like **ἐν ἄγκῃ* a locative, = 'in bonds,' see *TAPA*. 37, 9 seq. Unless we suppose that *necessarii* 'coniuncti, affines' and *necessitudo* 'coniunctio, affinitas' came into Latin by translation from *ἀναγκαῖοι* — and this seems to me a very unlikely assumption — we cannot cling, not even for the sake of the hoary mother-in-law joke, to the definition of *necessarius* as 'unavoidable.' I have pointed out (l.s.c.) that the Horatian *Necessitas* was the "Binder," equipped with all the tools for binding. In Greek the following examples are especially apposite, Aeschylus, *Prom.* 108, *ἀνάγκαις ταῖσδ' ἐνέζευγματι τάλας*; Soph. *Ph.* 1025, *ἀνάγκη ζυγεῖς*; *Aj.* 944 (cf. Eur. *Or.* 1330) *ἀνάγκης ζυγόν*; Eur. *I.A.* 443, *ζεύγματι ἀνάγκης*. For further illustration of our semantic problem I address myself to the study of the relation between

viii. Eng. *thong* : Av. *θang-* 'ziehen'

46. If these words are cognate, their root, as older Eng. *thwong* shows, must have been *tweng(h)*. Their meaning invites identification, cf. Eng. *tug* 'strap, trace, thong': Lat. *ducit* 'zieht.' In Avestan, *tweng(h)* would yield *θwang-*, but the by-form *teng(h)* would yield *tang-*, and *θang¹* is due to a confusion of the two. A cognate root with *k* is represented in Skr. *tanákti*, with a by-form (grammatical) *tvanákti* 'zusammenzieht, coagulates.' A further cognate in O Bulg. *tegnati* 'ziehen' (see Zupitza, *BB.* 25, 89, who unnecessarily writes the root as *theng-*). The direct sense of 'bind' is well attested in Slavic forms (see Miklosich, *Wibch.*, p. 350).

47. The root *twengh* seems to me a clear compound of a preposition *tu* + the root *engh* in its prepalatal stage (§§ 10, 15). And what is the preposition *tu*? It is found alive in

¹ Unless *w* was lost by dissimilation in *θ[w]anware* 'bow.'

Ir. *to* 'ad' and, as Bugge² has seen, in Goth. *du*, from *θu- in enclitic relation to its noun.¹ As for the vocalism of *tu-*, a reference to ἀπίν and πρύν- (v. Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*³ § 9, anm.) puts us on the track. In these forms we have pre-Greek *u*, apparently, and may attribute the same *o/u* alternation to the preverb *to-/tu-*. In view of Eng. "to and fro" and "to and from" the combinations "tuk^we apuk^we" and "tuk^we pruk^we" may be restored, cf. Av. āča parača 'to and fro,' Lat. *susque deque* and *reciprocus*, developed from a hypostatic *requeproque*, whence, by normal phonetic development (-co-, whence *ci*, from -que- before *p-c*) *reciproc(o)s* (Fay, *AJP*. 31, 414).

47a. Cognate with *thong* is Germ. *zwang* quasi 'ἀνάγκη, necessitas,' and this is as aptly illustrative of the sense of *necessitas* (when = 'relation, tie'), as of ἀνάγκη.

ix. Lat. *iuvenis*, *iuvencus*, *iovo*

48. The words *iuvenis* and *iuvencus* belong to a multitudinous sept, but I know of no etymology for them. I propose to connect them with the root of Skr. *yāuti* 'jungit.' I take it that the *iuvenes* were the 'coniuncti' of a household, the members of the *band* of a pater familias, cf. Skr. *bāndhu-s* 'amicus, angehöriger' and, collectively, 'genossenschaft.' The connotation 'young' had been established, of course, before the break-up of the Indo-European race. One may wonder whether the Roman connotation of 'soldier boy' (in *iuvenis* and *iuventus*) may be an inheritance. But the sense of *iuvenis* may have been derived as in Lat. *pignera* glossed by *filii* (*pignus* : *pangit*, with Bréal and with Niedermann ap. Walde, s.v.; from a root *pē(y)-n̄g-*, see § 23 fn.), cf. Skr. *bandhá-s* 'pignus' (*PW*.², 13) : *bandhula-s* 'bastard,' cf. *vóθos* 'bastard' : the root *ne-dh-* (Fay, *Cl. Rev.* 13, 400), and Skr. *sūnú-s* 'son' : *sūnā* 'woven basket,' *sūtra-* 'yarn.'

¹ I think with Bugge (*PBB*. 12, 399 sq.) that we may reckon with proclisis in German as well as in Irish, and as Irish *to* proclitically became *do*, I infer that Germanic *þu* (or, with Bugge, *þu* —) became *du-*. I am aware that the explanation is merely *ad hoc*, and begs the question, but it does apply a known principle of explanation (see § 42), and prepositions meaning 'apud, ad' are wont to be toneless, e.g. -ðe and Av. -da, Umbr. -co(m).

48a. For *iuvencus* 'bullock': Skr. *yuvaçá-s* 'iuvenis,' start-form *yu-wñko-s* (or better *3uwanñko-s*, Fay, *AJP.* 25, 163), instead of the current explanation by a suffix *-ko-*, I am disposed to set up the division *3u-w-ñkó-s*, tautological like Skr. *bandhu-päçá-s* 'fetter' (*AV.*) or Ger. *bandnerve* " 'tendo,' was sonst band allein ausdrückt." Whether we start with 'bullock' or 'youth,' the definition 'bändig'¹ (= 'qui vinculo paret, qui domatur,' Grimm) is apposite.

49. With the cognation of Lat. *iuvat* 'helps' and Skr. *yuyóti* 'separates' I am but half satisfied, for *yuyóti* is nothing but *yáuti* 'iungit,' with a meaning given to it by separative prepositions, cf. Ger. *ab-spannen, aus-spannen*, generalized to 'loose' from 'unhitch,' and above all *ἀποζεύγνυται, διαζεύγνυται* = 'separatur, liberatur.' In Lithuanian, *veriu* = both 'claudio' and 'recludo.' In combination with a separative case the simplex *yáuti* would also tend to mean 'ties, hinders, separates from.' It was possible, by allocation of the flexional type *yuyóti* to the sense 'separat' and of *yáuti* to the sense 'conjugit,' to secure perfect clearness, but cf. Ger. *aufbinden* ap. Grimm, *Wtbch.* 3: "der Zusammenhang hat zu entscheiden ob 'ein mädchen mit aufgebundnem haar' ausdrücke mit zierlich aufgeputztem oder mit frei und losfliegendem." It is from the sense of 'iungit' that Lat. *iuvat* 'helps' derives, and along the simplest lines. If we note the generalization of Skr. *yuñj-* and of *yu-* (both nouns found in a Veda [MS.] which has preserved words of proethnic stock not elsewhere extant in Sanskrit) 'comes,' an example like *⟨hac re⟩ me adiutamini* (mid.) lends itself to conception as "companion me in this," whence, by natural inference, 'help me.' But *hoc me adiutamini* might mean 'join this with me,' and the *me* was instrumental, misunderstood as accusative. It is curious how the etymological sense may be restored to a Gellian archaism (2, 29, 7) which, in point of construction, stands quite alone, *⟨ut⟩ messim nobis adiuvent* = 'to bind up this crop with us.' The sense 'it delights me' (*me iuvat*), whether of special Latin origin or not, is comparable with Skr. *yuñjána-s* 'dem es wohlgeht' (*PW.*² 16), *yukta-m* "günstig" (*ib.* 17 p.).

¹ Cf. Aratus, cited in § 19, fn.

x. Gr. *ἔσχατος* : Lat. *angulus* ; ὄχθοις

50. Of *ἔσχατος* we possess a gratifying amount of knowledge. We know that its startform was *eghs* + a termination also found in *ἔγ-κατ-α* 'the inwards.' A definition of *κατ-* is missing. I derive it from the root *ḱē(y)-* 'iacere,' whose long vocalism may be inferred from Skr. -*çī-* 'lying,' -*çīma*, -*çītha-s*, cf. *çāy-in* 'lying' and Homeric *κῶμα* 'sopor.' Bartholomae writes the Avestan root as *sāy-* and the p. ptc. *sita-* may derive either from -*ḱē-to-* or from -*ḱī-to-*. In *κείμαι*, derivation from *ḱēymai* is possible, and Skr. *çāyate* may be from *ḱṣyé-*, with secondary accent, cf. inf. *çayādhyāi* (*R.V.*) and *çayātha-* 'lair.' Thus analyzed *ἔσχατος*, i.e. *eghs-kāto-s*, = 'outlying,' a rendering actually found in L. & Sc.

51. This raises the question of the etymology of *eghs* 'out,' and if one will study the Homeric examples, including *ἔσχατή* and *ἔσχατόων*, the definition 'grenz-liegend' for *ἔσχατος* can hardly fail to suggest itself, being especially pat for the Thracians, on the outskirts of the Trojan forces, K 434. In other connections *ἔσχατοι* = 'borderers.' Thus *egh(e)s-* 'binding, border, boundary' admits of being derived from the root *egh-* (§§ 15, 3°; 29) 'iungere.' We may somewhat specifically compare O Bulg. *granica* 'grenze': *granič-* 'ecke, corner,' and ask if **eghes-* meant 'corner.' In this case Lat. *angulus* is an ultimate cognate, from the root *e-negh-* (see §§ 36, 44, fn.) as *ἀγκύλη* ('band, loop, thong, bend of the arm') is from the root *e-nek-*. For the notion of 'bend' is, I infer, as in English, derived from the notion of 'bind,' and as we account for Eng. *bend* from the act of 'binding the bow,' so we may account for the development of the Skr. verb *āñcati* 'bends' from a prepalatal form of the root *e-nek* 'binds.' As to the vocalism of the root, *ἀγκιστρον* 'hook' (*ἀγκ-* as in *ἀν-ἀγκη*, § 44, fn.), Lat. *ancus* 'qui aduncum brachium habet': Lat. *uncus*, *ὄγκος* 'barb' are important evidences for *enek-*. An interesting specialization of meaning is found in Indo-Iranian **anku-* 'stalk' (of the Soma plant), cf. Eng. 'joint' (of grass or of a cane), and Skr. *báñdhana-m* "stiel (einer frucht, einer blüthe"). I also explain *iuncus* as a tautological compound

from *yū-* + *-nko-s*, quasi 'tie-binder' (pace Fick-Stokes, p. 223; Mod. Ir. *aoin* 'joint-grass' ('bent') will be due to some foreign influence, as of Eng. *joint* or Fr. *joindre*).

52. With **eghes-* 'border' I connect Homeric *δχθη* 'bank, dyke' (natural or artificial), with meaning as in Skr. *bán-dhana-m* 'eindämmen, damm.' The sense of 'border' is clear in the compound *δχθοι-βος* = 'on-border-strap' (-*βος* from *-gʷos* as in Lat. *boves* 'straps,' see § 27): note the instructive variants *ἐκθιβος* and *ἐκθροιβος* (Schmidt, Hesychius, ed. min.² p. 490, no. 1400, fn.), in which *ἐκθι-* is a locatival, doing duty for *ἐκτοθι* (cf. the dialectal pair *ἐκτός* : *ἐχθός*), and *ἐκθροι-* is a locative of *ἐχθρο-*: Lat. *exterus* (see Fay, *AJP*. 31, 420). These variants are popular attempts to restore the subconscious and nearly vanished feeling for *δχθοι-βος* 'border-stripe.'¹

xi. *δγχνη* and other words meaning 'pear'

53. Schrader in his *Reallexikon*, s.v. *Birne*, very properly connects with *δγχνη* the words *ἀχράς* and *ἀχερδος*, the latter a thorny wild pear tree used for hedges (*Odys.*). He also makes the entirely unsupported suggestion that the *ἔγχος* (= 'pike') was made of pear-wood, whereas the *ἀχερδος* is vastly more likely to have been named from its 'spikes.' It is, however, from the sense of 'binding' and to the root *e-neḡh-*, so widely studied above, that these names of the pear are to be referred. By turning up the references cited in L. Meyer's lexicon (1, pp. 148, 151), and especially the scholia to Aristophanes, *Eccl.* 351-355, the 'binding,' i.e. 'astringent, constit-

¹ It would certainly be curious if the name of the several 'fastening' devices in -*βος* included in a group collected by Sturtevant in *CP*. 5, 340 did not exhibit in -*βος* the word for a 'cowhide strap,' and above all Hesiodic *μέσαβον* 'yoke-thong,' or rather 'mid-strap,' cf. the variant *μεσάτιον* (in the technological writer, Pollux), an *īyo* derivative of *μέσ(σ)αρος* 'middlemost,' whence *μέσα-* in *μέσαβον*. Pollux also gives *μεσβ-βον*, in which -*βον*, from *gʷovoyom*: Skr. *gávya-m* 'ner-vus' (i.e. bowstring, lexical), seems rather clear, in view of Plautine *boiae*, a loan word from -*βοῖον*, not -*βοεῖα*. It surely does not militate against this that the *boiae* came to be made of wood or iron (pace Solmsen, *KZ*. 37, 24; Sommer ap. Walde, s.v. *bōj-a*): are not "ties" on railroads made of wood, and about cotton bales of iron? Cf. the *κυνέη πάγχαλκος*. Further note *bo(v)a* = strap-snake(?), and see on *schlange*, § 27 and fn.

pating' character ascribed to the *ἀχράσ* sept must strike any reader, as it surprised me when I asked myself whether there could be a possible connection between *ογχνη*, later *οχνη*, and the root *e-negh-*. Morphologically, it is of interest to note in these words the variation of *n* and *r* stems, and the double weakening in *ἀχράδ-* as compared with *ἄχ-ερ-δο-* — which admit of analysis as 'constrictionem-dans.'¹

54. It remains to speak a word on the later Greek form *οχνη* (Theocritus), with dissimilative (?) loss of *γ* from *ογχνη*. This may show us how, in our primitive speech, the *n* of *engh-* came to be lost, yielding a "root" *egh-*. So *οκνος*, the rope-binder of Polygnotos, may have first been named **Ογκνος*, i.e. 'nexor': the root *e-nekh-*; *οκνος* 'sluggishness' would then have had the development of sense found in *piger*, *νωχελής* (§ 16, 1°).

VI. Skr. *ándhas-* (1) SOMA-PLANT, (2) DARKNESS. O Bulg.
j-agnedū 'POPLAR'

55. As Skr. *amçú-s* 'soma-stalk' (§ 51) may be derived from *enku-s*: *enekh-* 'vincire,' so *andhas-* : *āvθos* 'plant, flower' (for *a-* see § 44, fn.) may be derived from *ndhes-* 'binding.' From the same root *enedh-* 'to bind,' passing to the senses of 'to blindfold, cover' (cf. Gallic *anda-bata* 'blindfold-fighter'), *ándhas-* 'darkness' may come. From the root *ened(h)-* we also have Skr. *andu-s* 'fusskette' (startform *ndu-*): Lat. *ānus* 'fetter' (Plautus), if for *annus* (startform *ndno-s*). Irish *áinne*, glossed by 'anellus' may owe its apex, particularly as gen. *ainne* occurs in a text without an apex, to the glossist's feeling for *ānus*.² Then *anne* is from *ndniā* rather than from *a(n)kniā*

¹ So *ἄπιος* : Lat. *pirus* will mean (arbor or fructus) 'constringens,' and belong with *apere* 'to bind' and with *apis* 'bee,' the 'joiner,' the 'carpenter-bee,' to wit. Here also Lat. *apium* 'parsley,' used for binding into chaplets. The Greek *ἄπιος*, a sort of Euphorbia, was also called *τσχας*, and had a leaf like the *πήγανον* (= 'rue'); *τσχάς* can hardly have meant anything but 'holding' (from 'binding,' cf. *δχανον*, § 16, 4°), and the same definition suits *πήγανον*, unless that meant 'binding-plant,' i.e. 'border plant' (cf. *οὐδός* ἐν σελινῷ οὐδός ἐν πηγάνῳ = 'not on the border').

² Whether vacillations like *rán* | *rann* | *rainn* (see Thurneysen, *air. Gram.* § 43) furnish other evidence for original *ā* I cannot judge.

(so Fick-Stokes, p. 16). I also see noun stems from the root *enēd(h)-* 'vincire' in the following compounds, names of plants, O Bulg. *j-agn-ēndū* 'felloe-tree' (see § 39, fn.), Skr. *aru-ndh-atī* 'schling-pflanze,' Lat. *aru-ndo* 'joint-plant' (also used of limed twigs and wreaths). In the last two compounds *aru-* will belong with the root of *ἀπαίσκει* 'joins.'